

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the subject application as amended herein is respectfully requested.

The Examiner has not rejected claims 5 and 6 on the prior art. Accordingly, claim 1 has been amended by incorporating therein the limitations of claim 6. Claims inconsistent with this change have been cancelled.


The Examiner has rejected claims 17-22 because in his view the term "ablate" is a field of use and not a claim limitation. The Applicants disagree with this position but in order to obtain an expeditious allowance, claim 17 has been amended to positively recite that the subject apparatus provides ablations. Moreover, the claim 17 has been further amended to describe that the subject apparatus "said controller further being coupled to said optical network to thereafter provide a second ablation at a central portion of the cornea to restore said central zone to its condition prior to said peripheral ablation" as recited in claims 6 and 22.

It is respectfully submitted that the subject application is clearly patentable and therefore it should be allowed.

Respectfully submitted  
GOTTLIEB RACKMAN & REISMAN, P.C.

Dated: June 2, 2005

By: \_\_\_\_\_



Tiberiu Weisz  
Attorney for applicants  
Reg. No. 29,876

**CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:**  
GOTTLIEB, RACKMAN & REISMAN, P.C.  
270 Madison Avenue  
New York, New York 10016-0601  
Phone : (212) 684-3900  
Facsimile: (212) 684-3999